IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA GREENSBORO DIVISION

LLOYD BELL, Individually and)	
As Executor of the Estate of BETTY)	
WHITLEY BELL, Deceased,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CASE NO. 1:17-cv-00111
v.)	
)	
AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL)	
INDUSTRIES, INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SEAL

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.4, Plaintiff Lloyd Bell, individually and as executor of the estate of Betty Whitley Bell, deceased, files this Brief in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Seal. Plaintiff is seeking to seal his Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Protective Order and Sanctions, and Exhibits D and E thereto. The documents contain confidential, protected information.

In his Motion for Protective Order and Sanctions, Plaintiff is requesting protection of certain confidential, sensitive information. Specifically, Plaintiff is seeking to prohibit discovery or inquiry into and disclosure of the identity of the human subjects of a peer-reviewed study authored by Plaintiff's expert, Dr. Jacqueline Moline. Plaintiff is also requesting the Court order all existing copies of documents disclosing the identity of the human subjects be destroyed and not disseminated in this or any other case or forum.

As detailed in his Motion for Protective Order, one of the human subjects in Dr. Moline's study has been de-anonymized. As a result, portions of Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order and reveal that Betty Bell, the decedent in this case, was one of the human subjects in Dr. Moline's

study – the precise information Plaintiff argues is confidential and is seeking to protect. Furthermore, Exhibits D and E to Plaintiff's Motion are electronic communications between counsel in this case discussing the issue at hand and revealing Ms. Bell's identity as a human subject. Medical research has rules to protect the privacy of human research subjects and maintain the confidentiality of data, and courts routinely protect personal identifying information about human subjects. See *Lampshire v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 94 F.R.D. 58 (N.D. Ga. 1982); *Doe v. Am. Red Cross Blood Servs., S.C. Region*, 125 F.R.D. 646 (D.S.C. 1989). The same information should be protected and kept confidential in this case. Plaintiff has taken care to redact only the portions of the Motion that reveal confidential information regarding the identity of a human

For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant Plaintiff's Motion to Seal and permit the filing under seal of the unredacted documents.

Dated: September 15, 2020

subject from Dr. Moline's peer-reviewed study.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Leah C. Kagan

Leah C. Kagan

New Jersey Bar No. 013602009

Attorney for Plaintiff

SIMON GREENSTONE PANATIER, PC

1201 Elm Street, Suite 3400

Dallas, TX 75270

214-276-7680

lkagan@sgptrial.com

/s/ William Marc Graham

William Marc Graham

NC State Bar 17972

WALLACE AND GRAHAM, PA

525 N. Main Street

Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

704-633-5244

bgraham@wallacegraham.com

Local Civil Rule 83.1 Counsel

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned	hereby certifies that	t on September 15	, 2020, the forego	ing Instrument
was filed via ECF filing	which will serve all	l counsel of record	in the above-refe	renced matter.

/s/Leah C. Kagan Leah C. Kagan